THE MISSION TO ROME.

REMARKS

OF

HONS. JOHN A. BINGHAM, H. L. DAWES, G. S. ORTH, AND GEORGE F. HOAR.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MAY 19, 1870.

WASHINGTON:
CUNNINGHAM & MCINTOSH, PRINTERS.
1870.

Remarks of Mr. Bingham of Ohio.

Mr. BINGHAM. I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BROOKS] has seen fit to reply to objections made to the proposed amendment to this bill by imputing to this side of the House any desire to persecute Rome on account of the peculiar religious notions entertained by the See of the Papal States. It was unworthy of the gentleman. Instead of making such an appeal as that to passion and prejudice, instead of making any such bid as that for the votes of any religious sect in America, he would have done well to have told this House and the country what occasion there is for any other representative of this country at Rome than that which is already provided by this bill. This bill makes an appropriation for a consul at Rome, and that answers at once the suggestion of the gentleman that there is in this bill any intendment to strike at that people on account of their peculiar religious faith.

Rome, Mr. Chairman, needs no particular eulogy at the hands of gentlemen who suppose that that particular religious sect supports the Democratic organization of this country; for, sir, recent events have shown to reflecting men that that power itself is no longer a unit, and cannot be. The syllabus recently uttered by the head of that organization is a declaration of principles which, I venture to say, the gentleman from New York himself dare not indorse and go home among his people. It is an attempt to fetter the freedom of conscience; it is an attempt to fetter the freedom of speech; it is an attempt to fetter the freedom of the press; it is an attempt to strike down the rising antagonism to every despotism on the face of the earth, in the form of representative government, foremost among which is America, the child and the hope of the earth's old age. Talk to me at this era of history about Rome being the "patron of science and the mother of arts!" Why, sir, of that genius that makes the marble wear the divine beauty of life, and lays all the elements of nature under contribution, there is more to-day in living America than was ever dreamed of in Rome, living or dead. Why, then, talk at this day about dignifying that little principality with a resident minister from America? Do not gentlemen know that in the light of the teachings of that foremost of all the men bred in the faith of the church of Rome (and I admit she has bred many great and noble men, who knew how to make humanity itself beautiful even amid the terrors and tortures of martyrdom,) uttered a word when under the ban of Charles V, and Leo X, and Henry VIII, which reverberates to-day all over Christendom; I refer, sir, to the Augustine monk who found out for himself and proclaimed to mankind the great central truth which to-day possesses the enlightened mind of the nineteenth century, that no mitered head may, of the grace of God or of divine right, interpose its dark shadow btween man and his Maker. By that word Martin Luther became the liberator of the human race; it made the immortal period of human history, the reformation, the insurrection of the human mind, against the despotism which for centuries had enslaved it. Under the omnipotence of that utterance every tyrant, whether in Rome or out of it, holds to-day the reins of power with a tremulous and unsteady hand; and the day is not far distant when every throne of despotism shall turn to dust and ashes before the consuming breath of the enlightened opinion of the civilized world, which declares for free governments, free churches, free schools, free Bibles, and free men.

In reply to remarks of Mr. VOORHEES, in the further discussion of the proposition, Mr. BINGHAM spoke as follows:

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think that the learned gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. VOORHEES,] with all his gifts of intellect, might have furnished some kind of reasons for changing this proposed appropriation from a consulate at Rome to a resident minister other than assuming that power which belongs alone to the Deity to sit in judgment upon my motives of conduct, public and private, in violation of the rules of this House and the rules which ought to obtain among gentlemen. I would like to know by what assumed authority or by what conferred authority, whether he derives it from Rome or elsewhere, the gentleman undertakes to say that I never felt for the Catholic any of that charity, which is the divinest of all the graces? Does the gentleman propose to-day to constitute himself a father confessor? Does he propose to-day to assume to himself the functions of Peter, and to clutch in his hands the keys which are to open or to shut for me the gates of deliverance? There was nothing that was uttered by me on this occasion, nothing that has ever been uttered by me on any occasion, no vote ever given by me that justified any such imputation. Without making the slightest boast about it, I beg

leave to say that it was my good fortune, as it was doubtless the good fortune of the gentleman himself, to be reared in the belief that men should help one another. I am not aware that the poor were ever turned away from my door empty. I am not aware that I was behind the gentleman, or any one else not influenced by any mere personal considerations, when a calamity swept over a large area of our common country, equal in extent to the State which I have the honor in part to represent here, in my efforts to send succor and relief to the sufferers, without inquiring whether they were of my religious belief or not, whether they were of my political faith or not.

I took occasion to say, when I spoke upon this question before, that I repelled for myself, and for those that I represent, the assertion made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BROOKS] that this resistance to changing the representative of the United States at Rome from a consul to a resident minister was on the ground of any hostility to the utmost freedom of religion in Rome or elsewhere. I say now to the gentleman, and I say it to every gentleman who does me the honor to listen to my poor words, that it is with me a conviction as strong as knowledge, that religious belief, of whatever character, ought to be tolerated, that error itself "may be tolerated," in the words of the foremost Democrat of America, "where reason is left free to combat it."

I did say something here, however, which the gentleman has not seen fit to reply to, and I challenge him here and now to reply to it, that the syllabus but recently issued with the sanction and under the direction of the ruler, temporal and spiritual, of the See of Rome strikes at freedom of conscience, strikes at religious freedom, strikes at the freedom of representative government, strikes at the right of the people to establish and maintain for themselves a government—in short, strikes at all the advanced and accepted ideas of the nineteenth century. I said then, and I repeat it now, that I did not believe any gentleman on the other side of the House would dare this day to republish that syllabus and declare that he accepted it as his creed, either moral or political. I assigned it as a reason, among others, why, in view of this fact, that this syllabus divides that ancient church itself, arraying against it some of the first intellects acknowledging its authority, and to day representing this country in that great council at Rome, we should not consider it important to dignify Rome at present with any higher representative than a consul. And the gentleman makes that an occasion for assailing me as having no charity!

Let some one of that order of people who acknowledge the obligations of this syllabus, and who accept the dogma that now shakes that organization from its centre to its foundation, the infallibility of the visible head of the church, say as much for the freemen of America as I have said, that they have a right to think for themselves and speak for themselves in matters civil as well as religious. I will not do the gentleman the injustice to suppose that he himself accepts any such creed for himself. I beg him to understand that I will allow no man to impose any such creed on me, and I trust that by the grace of God I will have the manhood here and everywhere to stand for those free principles of intellect and of conscience out of which has sprung this last, greatest, noblest empire among men. In making the remarks I did I said what was allowable to be said, I think, taking care to discriminate betwen the bigoted, fanatical religious zealots of that church and the great and gifted men who have adorned by their lives, and adorned as well by their deaths, humanity itself.

That is what I said; and yet the gentleman says that I have no charity. Why, sir, counting myself the humblest being within these walls, I have charity enough to know, what has come to be understood by the intelligent head and living heart of men the world over, that beneath the heavens there is nothing so divine as humanity, whether it be clothed in the faith of the Catholic, or in the faith of the Protestant. I beg leave further to say to the gentleman, that I have read the story and been taught it at my mother's knee, as he, doubtless, has been, of that Divine Being who has given to the world what is ere-long to be the acknowledged moral constitution of men and nations. I appreciate all His lessons of humanity; I appreciate all His lessons of charity, according to the measure of that reason with which it has pleased the Good Father to endow me; and I bow as humbly before all the teachings of Him who shed majesty over the manger and the straw as does the gentleman from Indiana. His remarks, therefore, touching my feelings toward any portion of the human race were simply gratuitous, made, no doubt, in the heat and excitement of the moment, in the interests of party, and not in that broad, catholic spirit which usually characterizes the utterances of that gentleman.

Remarks of Mr. Dawes, of Massachusetts.

Mr. DAWES spoke as follows:

Mr. DAWES. I move to amend the amendment by making the total amount appropriated by this paragraph $141,000. I do not desire to continue this debate, because I think enough has already been said to demonstrate the mo-

tive which prompted the original amendment, and the purpose of it as well as the occasion for it.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] will have no personal discussion with me; I have no personal defense to make to anything he may have said. In reply to what he has said about my want of charity toward the gentleman from New York, [Mr BROOKS,] I will barely say that I have, as he has said, heard the gentleman from New York declare, on three several occasions, that he never was inside of a Know-Nothing lodge. I take that to be so; I have always taken it to be so. But it never altered the facts, nor does it now require a particle of modification of anything I have said. The gentleman from Indiana knows as well as does the gentleman from New York that the gentleman from New York has been an advocate of that political doctrine.

Mr. BROOKS, of New York, That is not so.

Mr. DAWES. His paper was the organ of the party, and while it was in power he endeavored to obtain all the benefits he could from it, and keep his head at the same time out of the halter. And therefore it is that whenever the gentleman has the opportunity he makes haste to do works mete for repentance.

In regard to the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] about the State of Massachusetts, the burning of convents and the burning of witches, he may indulge in them as much as he pleases; he will not provoke me to make any reply in words. That is an old story, all worn out long ago. I propose rather to discuss the necessity of a minister at Rome. I propose to pass by all that gentlemen upon the other side feed upon, the opportunity to make a little political capital with a particular religious sect. I intend to put out of mind all that kind of talk. But I ask the gentleman to bear in mind, although I do not suppose they care anything about it, that Rome has shut us out of religious worship according to our own tenets within the walls of that city, and compelled the American residents there to go outside of her walls to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, or do it in the minister's house, protected by our flag. I suppose that is nothing to the gentlemen on the other side; they do not care anything about that. Any indignity which this Power may heap upon American citizens because of their religious sentiments does not wound the national pride of my friend from Indiana, [Mr. VOORHEES.] He rises above all such considerations.

Mr. COX. Let me say a word just here. The statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts about—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. DAWES. No, sir; I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield, and must not be interrupted.

Mr. DAWES. I am reminded, also, of another matter, which, I suppose, instead of wounding the national pride of my friends on the other side, is perhaps a reason why they are so anxious to send a minister to Rome. The fact that this Power took sides with the enemies of our country in the late war, and recognized the Southern Confederacy, is a fact equally powerless, I presume, with every other national consideration, to deter our friends on the other side from renewing diplomatic relations with this power. Such relations have been suspended for years under a Democratic Administration; but now, when we have come into power, my friend from Indiana proclaims aloud, "I propose to brand it upon the Republican party that they refuse to do what was not done in the last administration, renew diplomatic relations with this power, and refuses because of its peculiar religious tenets." No advocate of this mission has placed the matter upon the the ground on which the continuance of our missions to other nations is based.

In support of this proposition not a word has been uttered which would support the continuance af any other mission. This whole movement is based upon the prime motive, which is too manifest, too transparent to deceive for a moment the American people. Gentlemen on the other side will have the benefit of this; and I do not desire to detract an atom from any advantage they may expect in that regard. I accord to them the entire benefit which they seek. But for myself I prefer a consistent, straightforward course, without regard to anything of that kind. When my duty prompts me to introduce a proposition to re-establish this mission I shall do so; while my duty requires me to oppose its re-establishment I shall oppose it.

Remarks of Mr. Orth, of Indiana.

Mr. ORTH spoke as follows:

Mr. ORTH. Mr. Chairman, the debate upon these amendments has taken rather a wide and extraordinary range; but I think every impartial observer upon this floor will concur with me when I say that the religious aspect given to it came from the other side of the House. Now, sir, I am opposed to re-establishing this mission at Rome irrespective of any question of religion, because, first, in truth and in fact, Rome is no "Power" in the sense as applied to nations; secondly, because we have no commerce and no political relations whatever with Rome, and hence there is no

necessity whatever of spending six or seven thousand dollars upon such proposed mission. I may also add there are Governments in Europe more important in point of population and more important in point of commerce than Rome to which we never have sent, and do not contemplate sending, diplomatic representatives. These were the reasons, and the only reasons, that were urged against the proposition on this side of the House.

The other side of the House, for purposes well known to themselves, for purposes that will be known and appreciated by the country, have sought to give this question a political aspect with reference to a large and respectable religious sect in this country; and, sir, I am well satisfied that religious sect will not thank them for thus needlessly dragging their church into this discussion. They will regard it, and the country will regard it, as a weak and puny effort to gain partisan power and friendship among the members of that church. The reasons I have stated induced Congress five years ago to discontinue this mission, and I know of nothing which should cause a reversal of that action. Rome has never had any intercourse of this character with us as a nation; never in all her past history. We have a consul residing there, vested with sufficient authority to attend to the various wants of the comparative few Americans who visit the "Ancient City" for purposes of business or pleasure.

But, Mr. Chairman, I should not have taken part in this debate but for a remark that fell from the lips of my colleague, [Mr. VOORHEES.] I would be derelict to the Republicans of my district and of the State at large if I did not seize the earliest opportunity to say that that remark was without foundation, and unworthy to be uttered upon the floor of this House. The language to which I refer, furnished to me by the reporters, is this: "In my own State it is said, 'Let the Irish go, let the Dutch go, we have got the negroes in their places.'" "It is said!" Who said it? Any Republican from Indiana in Congress or out of Congress? If my colleague is within the sound of my voice I will yield to him to inform this House as to what the authority is upon which he makes that charge

Mr. VOORHEES. The gentleman knows the authority just as well as I do.

Mr. ORTH. No, I do not; I yield to ascertain the authority.

Mr. VOORHEES. It is the current columns of the newspapers of both parties in Indiana.

Mr. ORTH. Mr. Chairman, I grant you that it is in the current columns of one class of partisan newspapers in my State, those representing the political party to which my colleague belongs; but I will yield to the gentleman again if he will name a single Republican paper among the one hundred published in my State that has ever uttered or indorsed such a sentiment.

Mr. VOORHEES. Undoubtedly they would deny it, just as old Know-Nothings deny their former principles upon this floor.

Mr. ORTH. I have given my colleage an opportunity to furnish to the House the authority for the charge that has been made here. Sir, it is base and groundless. Taken in connection with the preceding sentence, what does the gentleman mean by it when he says, "It is said?" He said, "Gentlemen on the other side flatter themselves that they have the negro vote of this country to enable them to dispense with the votes of the foreigners;" and then he proceeds: "In my own State it is said," &c. Now, sir, that gentleman knows as well as I do that in the ranks of the Republican party are found some of the most intelligent Germans and some of the most intelligent Irishmen in the State. He knows that there are to be found, in my town and in his own, men of the highest character and respectability belonging to the German and Irish nationalities who are hearty workers in the Republican cause, and have been so, and most emphatically so, since the first gun was fired at Sumter for the destruction of this Government.

Mr. VOORHEES. Allow me to ask a question.

Mr. ORTH. I cannot yield further out of my five minutes. I have given my colleague every opportunity to furnish his authority for the statement he has made here.

Sir, this statement of the gentleman is intended to go home to be retailed by the crossroads and groceery politicians of Indiana. They are to howl out that their Representative in Congress [Mr. VOORHEES] has said so and so, and of course it must be true. They will prove it to be so by simply reading his speech as published in the Globe. They will declare that the Republicans of Indiana, false to themselves, false to the noble men of Irish and German blood who have stood by them throughout the trying contest of the last ten years, now say, "Go, you Dutchmen; go, you Irishmen; we have negroes enough now to do without you." My colleague doubtless fancied that by this unjust attack he and his friends might induce a few voters to desert their present party affiliation; but let me assure him that he is counting without his host.

I have felt that it was due to the Republicans of Indiana of foreign birth that this much should be said by me. I have given my colleague [Mr. VOORHEES] an opportunity to state his authority for the assertion he has made here. He has referred me to the news-

paper press. I grant you that the Democratic press may have made such statements; but I repeat that no man belonging to the Republican party, in Congress or out of it, here or elsewhere, no newspaper of any kind advocating the principles of the Republican party, has ever made any such statement; and thus I dispose of the assertion made by my colleague, [Mr. VOORHEES,] who has taken upon himself thus to stigmatize the party that has had the control of the government of his native State in their hands for the last ten years, and which has in all respects been faithful to the best interests of our common constituency.

Remarks of Mr. Hoar, of Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR spoke as follows:

Mr. HOAR. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to prolong this debate, but I should be false to the trust which my constituents have delegated to me if I suffered the aspersions which the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] has allowed himself to utter upon the fair fame of the State, which I have the honor in part to represent, to pass without some answer from me. The gentleman has charged that the State of Massachusetts, in her early history, burned witches at the stake, and that in the year 1854 and 1855 she burned convents of the Catholics and Sisters of Charity, within her borders. Sir, both of those charges are utterly false. No human being was ever burned at the stake within the limits of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Mr. VOORHEES. That is not true.

Mr. HOAR. It is true that two hundred years ago, when the whole civilized world believed that witchcraft was a crime, following the law as they received it from the mother country, on the authority of certain passages in the Old Testament, the courts of Massachusetts did condemn and execute by hanging some nineteen or twenty persons of both sexes for the alleged crime of witchcraft. But it is also true that first among men the people of Massachusetts saw the error and wickedness of what they had done in that regard. It was their love of justice and their intelligence which first exposed the error and wickedness of punishing human beings for that alleged crime. The ministers of the Gospel, the witnesses and the counsel formed almost a penitential procession, and asked pardon of God and of their neighbors for having done those things.

The distinguished Chief Justice, Sewell, stood up in his place in the house of God, with bared head, and acknowledged that as an error which his contemporary, Sir Matthew Hale, failed to see the wickedness of while he presided over the courts of England. And in a diary kept by Chief Justice Sewell, opposite the record of those trials, are to be found these words of Latin interjection and sorrow "*væ! væ! væ!*—woe! woe! woe!" It is true that all mankind punished witchcraft, and Massachusetts for a time shared in the error and delusion; but it is also true that first of all mankind the people of Massachusetts saw the error and crime, and repented. Now, sir, who is he, with the words of Christian charity on his lips, who stands up here, two hundred years after these things occurred; and taunts his ancestors and mine—

Mr. VOORHEES (interrupting). Not mine.

Mr. HOAR, (continuing) With a crime which they so nobly repented of?

Mr. Chairman, it is not true that in the year 1854 or 1855 anybody within the limits of Massachusetts burned a Catholic convent or a Catholic institution of learning. In 1834, thirty-six years ago, a rumor spread one evening through the streets of Boston of some terrible cruelty said to have been practiced by the Catholics in the neighboring convent of Charlestown upon some young women who had been placed there. A mob was raised, and some wicked men, such as are always found in large cities, set fire to that convent. What did Massachusetts do? She arrested, tried, sentenced and punished the criminals; and the crime is no more to be imputed to her than any crime that ever has been committed within the limits of any civilized community is to be imputed to the authorities which have punished it.

It is true also that in the year 1855 the people of Massachusetts shared the prevailing delusion that the admission of foreigners to equality of representation in this Government was dangerous to our institutions; and that Commonwealth placed in her constitution a clause requiring such persons to reside in the State two years after naturalization before they should be admitted to exercise the privileges of citizenship. No power on earth could have struck that clause from the constitution of Massachusetts if she had not seen fit to do it herself. Yet notwithstanding the fact that every man affected by it, every voter who would be admitted by its abrogation would vote against the dominant party in the State, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, thinking the matter over, determined that such a measure of exclusion was unwise and inconsistent with those doctrines of civil liberty to which through all her history she was pledged. She said, "These men, although they differ from the great body of our citizens, ought to be politically their equals." In this spirit Massachusetts, of her own motion, voluntarily and because it was right, struck out this clause, which in her judgment invaded the great principles of constitutional liberty.

I wish simply to say in conclusion that in the face of this history of Massachusetts it does not become the political friends of the men who burned alive our soldiers at Fort Pillow, of the men who burned the orphan asylum in New York, who hung negroes upon lamp-posts—

[Confusion, and cries of "Order!"]

Mr. VOORHEES. Order! order! Every word the gentleman says is false, and he knows it. [Renewed cries of "Order!"]

Mr. HOAR, (continuing.) For no other reason than because they were defenseless, because they were loyal, and because they were black, to taunt her before the Representatives of the American people with the cruelties of past ages.